

FEBRUARY 16, 1954
805th BROADCAST

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 310 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Are the States Dominating the Cities?

Moderator, JAMES F. MURRAY, JR.

Speakers

GEORGE N. CRAIG

DAVID LAWRENCE



COMING

—March 2, 1954—

**Should Eighteen-Year-Olds Be Allowed
To Vote?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 19, No. 42



\$5.00 A YEAR, 25c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOLUME 19

No. 42



Are the States Dominating the Cities?

The Broadcast of February 16, 1954, from 9:00 to 9:45 P.M., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from the Palmer House, Chicago, under the auspices of the City Club of Chicago in conjunction with the Club's 50th anniversary dinner.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

GEORGE N. CRAIG—Governor, State of Indiana. George Craig was born at Brazil, Indiana, 1909. He was educated at the University of Arizona, and after graduating from Indiana University Law School engaged with his father in practice at Brazil. Having been in the U. S. Army Reserve Corps since 1932 he was called to active duty in 1942 and served four years, chiefly in the European Third Army under General George Patton, where he was battalion commander in the 80th Division and rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel. Leaving the service in 1946, he resumed law practice at Brazil and became active in the American Legion, where he was elected post, southern district, state and then national commander in 1949, the first World War II veteran so honored. Mr. Craig became governor of Indiana on January 12, 1953. During the first year of his term as governor he has made notable strides in building Indiana's mental health program, in rehabilitating the penal system, in combating the highway death toll and in governmental economy.

MAYOR DAVID LAWRENCE—Of Pittsburgh; Former Chairman of U. S. Conference of Mayors. David Lawrence assumed his first public office in 1933 when he was appointed collector of Internal Revenue for Western Pennsylvania. In January, 1935, he became Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. His first elective office was that of Mayor of Pittsburgh, for which he was inaugurated in 1946. He was re-elected in 1949 by the biggest majority ever accorded a mayoralty candidate in Pittsburgh. He took the oath of office for his third term as Mayor on January 4, 1954, after being accorded the unprecedented honor of being elected to Pittsburgh's top office for a third time. Mr. Lawrence has been politically active for most of his 63 years, becoming County Democratic Chairman when he was 31. In 1934 he was elected Chairman of the Democratic State Committee of Pennsylvania, a post which he held, except for a two year interval, until his election as Mayor. He is presently Democratic National Committeeman for Pennsylvania. A veteran of World War I and member of various veterans organizations, Mayor Lawrence is past president of the United States Conference of Mayors and is active in numerous civic organizations in his city and state.

Moderator: JAMES F. MURRAY, JR.—New York Attorney; International Counsel and Lecturer.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year. (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); six weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 25c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942 at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Are the States Dominating the Cities?

Announcer:

Tonight, Town Meeting is broadcasting from the Palmer House in Chicago, where the City Club is holding its fiftieth anniversary dinner. Gathered here are leading business and professional men of Chicago who conduct a year round program to provide a workable means for City Club members to exchange their ideas and to form suggested policies on civic matters that represent the best of their judgment.

Through its forums and committee activities, the Club maintains a continuing non-partisan study of the quality of Chicago's public servants. It frequently has been called "the conscience of the city." The organization has often been the leader in movements for the betterment of the metropolitan Chicago area.

The Club also co-operates with other groups having the same objectives, through the democratic exchange of ideas. Town Hall is proud to salute the officers and members of the Chicago City Club on this, its fiftieth anniversary.

Now to preside over tonight's discussion, here is your moderator, James F. Murray, Jr. Mr. Murray.

Moderator Murray:

Last year when President Eisenhower sought to implement his campaign pledges to reduce over-centralization of power in the Federal Government he encountered opposition, not from the centers of control in Washington, but from the representatives of large cities across the nation. Spokesmen for these municipalities, acting through the United States Conference of Mayors, declared their strenuous opposition to any legislation that

might alter the pattern of federal-city relationships in favor of state control.

The major argument of the cities was, in effect, an historical one. When our republic was founded at the close of the eighteenth century, we were a small rural nation. This factor was reflected with particular emphasis in the functional framework and political operations of our state governments. During the intervening 170-odd years, radical social and economic changes have accompanied our national expansion until today the pattern has shifted to the degree that only one-third of our population is rural and some two-thirds are city dwellers.

But our cities complain that despite this fundamental alteration in our way of life, the average state government and the majority of our state legislatures are, in effect, controlled by rural members, unsympathetic to home rule in the great cities. It is what they describe as indifference on the part of some states that the cities attribute their increasing reliance upon direct federal aid—especially with respect to slum clearance, public roads, civil defense, and similar costly projects essential to modern urban communities.

Of course the state governments reply that they disclaim these allegations and that the insistence must be laid on the fact that restoration, by Washington, to the states of powers and revenues now concentrated on a federal level would promptly redound to the benefit of the cities and urban areas everywhere. The basic issue then is this: Are the States Dominating the Cities or Are They Not? That is our topic tonight.

America's Town Meeting of the Air is happy to present this evening two distinguished leaders of state and municipal governments to discuss this very crucial question. Our first speaker is the former Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, now beginning his third term as Mayor of the City of Pittsburgh, the Honorable David Lawrence, Democratic mayor of Pittsburgh. Mayor Lawrence.

Mayor Lawrence:

Mr. Murray, ladies and gentlemen. The men who wrote the American Constitution were amazingly wise, but one thing they could not foresee was the transformation of this country from a rural to an urban nation. The result is that we have sovereign states and dependent cities. The American city has no rights that the state is bound to respect. The state, at its pleasure, can regulate the form of government of cities, remove elected officials of cities, take away the tax resources of the cities, or even abolish them as governmental units.

The cities of America, with all their population and all their stirring wealth-producing life, are the helpless wards of the state. All too often they find that the state is a cold and unfeeling guardian, with an active dislike for its step-children, the cities. State legislatures are almost always set up to keep city people in a permanent minority, no matter what their actual majority in the state's population may be. Cities must be governed under the charters permitted by the states, no matter what their residents may wish.

Cities may levy only such taxes as the state allows. State governments may take control of city functions or dictate the terms of em-

ployment of city workers. State revenues collected from city people are often distributed unfairly by the states, with little return to the city areas. State governments are slow to recognize the special problems of large cities, as witness the necessary intervention of the Federal Government to compel state action on highway bottlenecks around the big cities.

American cities do not have equal representation in the state legislatures. They do not have home rule in their own affairs. They do not share properly in the public wealth which their citizens produce. The states, in my opinion, ought to give the cities positive help. If they don't do that, they should at least have the decency to get out of the way.

Mr. Murray: Thank you very much, Mayor Lawrence. Now, for the negative side of our discussion this evening, and presenting the point of view of the states, a distinguished attorney from Indiana, beginning his second year as Governor of his home state, Republican Governor of Indiana, George N. Craig. Governor Craig.

Governor Craig:

Mr. Murray, I welcome the opportunity to be here this evening at the fiftieth anniversary of the City Club of Chicago. Now to discuss this question of state relationship with cities, it is a refreshing change. It seems to me that we should be talking about this question in view of the fact that for the past two decades the attention of all of our people has been focused overwhelmingly on the conduct of our national government in Washington.

As to the question before us, "Do the States Dominate Our Cities?" I think it is necessary

to understand that by the nature of things that is true, because cities derive powers from the states just as the states derive their powers from the Federal Government. Probably a better way to ask the question would be this: Should Our Cities Have More To Say Over the Conduct of Their Own Affairs? I believe that everyone is conscious of the fact that the cost of municipal government has gone up steadily and that many cities today are in serious financial straits.

Many cities want increased taxing powers to take care of these higher costs and they do not want to go to the state every time they want or desire more money. Now, I happen to be a strong believer in the principle of self-government and in the decentralization of government, and I see no reason why in some instances these greater taxing powers should not be granted to the cities.

However, I hasten to qualify this statement by adding that these taxes should be leveled across the board and not at any special group or groups, and they should, to the greatest extent possible, be determined by referendum. Cities should understand that with increased local tax authority would come an end to various state and federal aid programs. In other words, let's not allow the increase of local taxes to act as a camouflage for inefficient and extravagant local government.

And let's also make sure that when people in a town or city pay higher local taxes, they know what they are paying those taxes for. Over here in Indiana we have been aware of the financial problems of some of our cities. This was one of the reasons that we established what we called "the Little Manion Commission," to study the relationship between the

state of Indiana and the cities of Indiana. This commission is being patterned after the presidential commission headed by Dean Clarence Manion, which has been established to study federal-state relations.

In "The Little Manion" group we have some of the finest civic and business leaders of our state. I am confident that out of its deliberations will come some recommendations beneficial to our cities and to the principle of decentralized government. I think that other little Manion groups might well be of aid in other states. Let me summate what I have said with this statement.

I believe as we go through the evening we will find that the crux and the basis of the problem at hand is one of money and how we can best obtain more money for cities and towns and still not impair the financial structure of your federal and state governments.

Mr. Murray: Thank you very much, Governor Craig. Gentlemen, perhaps we could best open our exchange of views this evening if you would each give your own opinion on the basic topic of the evening: Do You Feel That States Are Dominating the Cities, and if so in What Respects?

Governor Craig: Mr. Murray, I believe that the states are dominating the cities. My concept of this problem is this: There are certain activities of government that are germane to our Federal Government. The best example of that is national defense. There are certain matters that are particular to our state government. I speak of highways, of state institutions of a hospital nature. I think of transportation, public safety, and, certainly and probably foremost, education.

Those matters are particular in their nature; they are matters of your state government. The state has the right to establish standards through the expression of the General Assembly, the Legislature. However, I do believe that a city or a town, after those standards have been met, has the right to have its tax base widened, so that it can do whatever it wishes within the realm of legitimate government for the privilege, comfort, and convenience of its citizens.

Mr. Murray: Mayor Lawrence.

Mayor Lawrence: I think the basic problem we are confronted with in the question of the rural areas of the states particularly dominating the larger cities is pointed up very well by the United States Conference of Mayors, where we estimate that three-fourths of the state legislatures are elected by one-third of the people. For instance, Fulton County, Georgia, in which Atlanta is located, is limited to three representatives in the lower house of the state legislature in which four rural counties, with a combined population one thirty-seventh that of Atlanta, have four representatives.

In Colebrook — in Connecticut, they have the last word in the rotten borough system — Colebrook, Connecticut, with a population of 600, has two representatives in the lower house, the same number as Hartford, which has a population of 177,000. As a matter of fact, the 700,000 persons who live in Connecticut's five largest cities are outvoted in the legislature by representatives from six towns whose total population is 10,000.

But probably the worst case of misrepresentation, or lack of representation, is in California. In Los Angeles County, with four million

people, they have one member of the California State Senate, as do three cactus counties with a combined population of 14,000. In New York City, with 55 per cent of the state's population, they have exactly 44.6 per cent of the seats in both the Senate and the Assembly.

A new bill now being considered in New York would reduce New York's representation to 43.1 per cent of the Senate and 43.3 per cent of the Assembly. And coming right back here to your dear old Chicago with more than one-half the population of Illinois, you have less than one-third the representatives at Springfield.

Mr. Murray: Gentlemen, in precisely what way, therefore, do the cities appear to suffer because of this dominance, in many instances, of the legislatures by rural areas? Are there any particular fields in which you feel the cities may be suffering because of this?

Governor Craig: I think that is very evident. I think the whole matter lies in the current reapportionment of representatives in your state legislature. Constitutions of most states make provision for it. I am not in a position to contest the figures given by the Mayor. The only thing I can say is that that horrible condition does not exist in the good old state of Indiana; furthermore, the reapportionment which will give adequate representation to the cities, in the areas where population has been concentrated, I think would solve the problem.

Mr. Murray: Gentlemen, in view of what appears to be the state of affairs, in so many instances, is home rule, as we commonly understand it, feasible or even possible?

Mayor Lawrence: I certainly do

think it is possible, and I think that cities have grown in a fashion that men like Washington and Jefferson, the founding fathers of this country, never dreamed of, because after all they were farmers and I'm told that some of them, even my patron saint, Jefferson, looked with a certain amount of disdain on urban areas; they never anticipated the growth of the urban areas similar to what we have here in Chicago and the other great centers of the country.

Governor Craig: Mayor, I think you are going back a little too far. I don't think you should blame all this on Washington and Jefferson. I'm a Republican and I wouldn't even blame it on Jackson. I think we have ourselves to blame for this. If the present-day legislature will follow the provision in its constitution (I think it obtains in about three-fourths of the states) and reapportion the states about every ten years, which is the usual requirement, as I recall, I think your problem will be solved. Now, I think that somebody is amiss in not requiring that the legislature follow the provisions of its state constitution. What do you have in Pennsylvania?

Mayor Lawrence: Well, we have a constitution that was adopted in 1874, and every time we attempt to have a constitutional convention, the reactionaries in Pennsylvania vote it down.

Governor Craig: Well, apparently you have a lot of reactionaries and not enough of something else.

Mayor Lawrence: You are absolutely right, but we are still hopeful.

Mr. Murray: Gentlemen, on that very point, what can be done to overcome public apathy, which

seems to be such a contributing factor in this situation?

Mayor Lawrence: In the Conference of Mayors, we are constantly trying to call the attention of the people to this problem, and we are more than grateful tonight to have the opportunity to be here on this program. Basically, we have four aims that we feel would help this whole situation if they could be adopted.

First, cities should be granted home rule and the right to adopt and amend their charters in order to determine their form of government, the duties of their public officials, the compensation and hours of work of city employees, and their tax structure. Second, cities should be given fair and equitable representation in the legislature.

Third, municipal tax limits should be established by city charter and not by statute. Fourth, states should provide equitable distribution of grants-in-aid and shared revenues on the basis of relative need, population, and contributions of local communities in state and federal taxes.

Governor Craig: I don't see too much wrong with your recommendations. It seems to me that if they were followed we might in most instances be following current law and current constitutional foundation. I would only like to call this to your attention. In the matter of the basic over-all requirements of state government, I do not believe that cities and towns should place their welfare before the welfare of all the people of the state.

I don't think you mean to make the statement that the rights of people in cities and towns exceed those who live in other communi-

ties or other political sub-divisions. It takes all sorts of people to make up a state, many interests—farming interests, agriculture and otherwise.

I would like to say this: It takes so much money to run the different echelons of government. It takes so much for the Federal Government; it takes so much for the state government; it takes so much for city, county and township governments, and school district governments. Now, that much money must be collected.

It seems to me we solve this problem when we see that the money in each of those governments is expended wisely and judiciously, and we give the opportunity for each of those echelons of government to satisfy their tax appetites and requirements within the realm of wholesome government, and that we do not permit one to impinge upon the other to their injury.

Mayor Lawrence: Governor, you're so correct on everything. I'm almost tempted to call you a Democrat.

Governor Craig: Well, you blamed our predicament on Washington, so I don't know whether I feel I have been honored by that statement or not.

Mayor Lawrence: One of the things you said, and you said to me today in discussing this whole problem, is that it resolves itself finally to the question of the tax money that is available. I'm very happy, and I say it is one of the outstanding things that President Eisenhower has done in appointing this Manion committee, so called, headed by Dean Manion. Unfortunately, the committee has not been functioning, and I feel if they get under way they can do a job

similar to the Hoover Committee, which I think was a forward step in government, and their job is to try to set up a program whereby the tax dollar can be divided in proper proportion.

I have some figures here that I believe will interest you on that particular question to show how the cities have gotten the worst of it over the last twenty years. In 1932, the Federal Government collected 1.9 billion, nearly 2 billion dollars in taxes. In 1952, this amount had increased 30 times, to 59.7 or almost 60 billion. Now in 1932, the states collected 1.9 billion, or nearly 2 billion in taxes, but in 1952 they collected 9.9 billion—an increase of five times.

Now, comes the poor relation of the governmental units—the cities. In 1932, the city governments collected 4.5 billion in taxes, and in 1952 they collected 9.2 billion, an increase of two times the 1932 amount. Do you catch my figures? The Federal Government collected 30 times as much, state governments 5 times as much, and the cities only twice as much, notwithstanding the tremendous population increase.

Governor Craig: I catch your figures all right, Mayor, but I don't like your reasoning. Now, here you say in the last twenty years. You understand my reasoning now?

Mayor Lawrence: I'm sort of getting on to it, Governor.

Governor Craig: Well, you say for the last twenty years the cities have gotten a bad deal. I'm inclined to agree with you. But I'm also inclined to agree that President Eisenhower and the Manion Committee ought to have more than six months to straighten out a twenty-year mess.

Mayor Lawrence: I think you are right.

Mr. Murray: Gentlemen, in your opinion what would be the effect on the cities if the present administration were to return state funds and functions, now under federal control, back to the states?

Governor Craig: I think that is the first step that must be taken, and I am assuming, and I am confident, this will happen. It will require some mature deliberation as Governor Stevenson, who I know is here tonight, would concur that you cannot unravel these powers, duties, and privileges in a moment. But after it has been done, after it has been passed back to the states, it is then the duty of the state to pass it on to the cities and towns wherever possible.

Mr. Murray: Mayor Lawrence, did you wish to comment on that?

Mayor Lawrence: Well, I pretty well agree with the Governor on the situation, but the thing that annoys us who are in municipal government is that in so many states we've received such bad treatment from the state governments that we prefer to deal directly with the Federal Government in these matters. If a proper formula could be worked out by the Manion Committee in the allocation of funds from the Federal Government to the state government, that they would be bound by certain rules and formulas in their treatment of the municipalities, by percentage of the population, that could very well work out.

Mr. Murray: Gentlemen, as you know, each week America's Town Meeting presents a complete twenty-volume set of the American People's Encyclopedia to a listener who submits the most provocative and timely question pertinent to

the subject under discussion. Tonight's question comes from Mr. George F. Reeves, 3125 Quebec Place, N. W., Washington, D. C. The question is this: "Does not domination of the cities by the states increase the reliance of the cities on the Federal Government for assistance in such fields as public housing?"

Mr. Murray: Governor Craig.

Governor Craig: Public housing, I believe, particularly in times of emergency, is a federal question. It transcends state boundaries. I don't think there is anyone who could conceive that any state could, in time of emergency or crisis from which federal housing has most of its genesis, take care of it. However, I do believe this, that when states do not perform their function of recognizing the rights of cities, of course, the cities are going to go elsewhere.

But I do believe when we get down to the final crux of this thing, and when the rights are passed from the Federal Government to the states, and then on to local government, we will find out that it is better for the taxing unit, be it state or Federal Government, to leave the tax money in the city in the first place, instead of collecting it, then passing it back to the cities. There is one thing about tax money—the more hands it goes through, the less there is when it comes out at the other end.

Mr. Murray: Mayor Lawrence?

Mayor Lawrence: Governor, you are absolutely right, and that is one of the reasons why the mayors of the country and the local authorities of the country have been opposed to going through the state capitals in a great many states, because too much of it stays there. The gentleman who asks the ques-

tion certainly almost gives the answer in his question. That is the reason why there is so much concern. Now, frankly and honestly, this doesn't apply to the 48 governors, and it doesn't apply particularly to any one political

party. It's just the jealousy that has cropped up and the fact that so many state governments, through their legislatures, are dominated by the rural members.

Mr. Murray: Thank you, Mayor Lawrence.

★

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Murray: Gentlemen, we have now come to one of the most interesting portions of America's Town Meeting, wherein we receive questions from our audience here at the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the Chicago City Club. I see a question on my left. Would you tell us for whom your question is intended, please.

Questioner: My question is addressed to Mayor Lawrence. Recognizing the failure of cities and their suburban neighbors to merge, do you think that state governments should revamp city boundaries in metropolitan areas?

Mayor Lawrence: That is a very dangerous thing if a state government could arbitrarily come in and do that. We had one instance of that in Pennsylvania many years ago, when old Allegheny City and the city of Pittsburgh were forcibly merged by the state legislature. It is certainly not home rule at all, and it is a domination of the local communities by the state government to go in and force it.

Unfortunately, there are many of these that we are pleased to call boudoir communities, that sleep out on the periphery of the city and make their money in the city. They don't pay their fair share of running the government in the big cities; we would like to corral them in some fashion.

Mr. Murray: Now I see a gentleman who has a question. Would you tell us for whom your question is intended?

Questioner: My question is directed to Governor Craig: Is it not true that one of the reasons small towns have a fear of reapportionment is that they feel that they may not get their share of the state money, and possibly face a collusion between the large cities who may power legislation in their favor?

Governor Craig: You're asking me what is in the mind of a legislator, and I can't answer that question other than to say this: I am confident that there is a feeling that the legislative body would be dominated on the matter of reapportionment. However, I think the experience of American government has always been that reapportionment has always performed more good than it did evil, and the basic concept of our government is that we have the representation that our population entitles us to.

Questioner: I have a question for Mayor Lawrence. Mayor, should there not be a sharp distinction, in any solution to this problem, between home rule for purposes of taxation and home rule for purposes of creating a separate political sub-division?

Mayor Lawrence: Personally, I

think they go hand in hand. If you have the home rule to run your government, you must likewise have home rule to pay the bills. That is the important thing, and, basically, that is the great problem that confronts us throughout this whole picture—the amount of money to run the government.

That is why, as I said previously, and Governor Craig likewise referred to it, why the Manion Committee was set up. If they function and bring in a proper kind of program, it is a step in the right direction, and I certainly hope they will get into the question promptly and give us an early report.

Questioner: I should like to ask both Mayor Lawrence and Governor Craig: How can legislators be compelled to comply with the constitutional provision that states be reapportioned, as they have failed to do in Illinois for the last fifty years?

Mayor Lawrence: If I may answer that question for you, the only weapon I know is at the polls.

Mr. Murray: Governor Craig.

Governor Craig: That's the only one I can suggest.

Mr. Murray: Next question, please.

Questioner: I'm interested in knowing whether Mr. Lawrence would advise home rule for wards and small communities within the city on the basis of his arguments for self-rule by cities.

Mayor Lawrence: Well, of course, you can go to a ridiculous minimum in trying to set up a program of that sort. Communities are now set up and have grown to a certain stature, and I'm not opposed in any sense to a large small community. We have cities throughout the country ranging from 8 million in New York

down to some very small number of hundreds in some of the smaller cities, and if you want to follow out your idea, you could also cut the ward down to the voting precinct.

Questioner: Governor Craig, why haven't the states done more to encourage home rule for the larger cities within their borders?

Governor Craig: I think we go back to the primary concept that we had, at least the one that I had, that it has been a failure on the part of legislative groups to reapportion legislative representatives. Cities have grown up within the borders of states, and there has been too great a time lag between their growth and provisions that would grant them the powers and privileges to conduct their affairs of government. It simply has been a lack of aptitude on the part of the legislative thinking to meet a very grave problem which now confronts people living in metropolitan areas.

Questioner: Mr. Lawrence, I would like to know if increasing power given to the cities in government might not in time infringe upon constitutional rights and imperil the liberties of minorities?

Mayor Lawrence: I certainly don't think so. I don't get your reasoning in asking the question. With all due respect, I think today throughout this country, starting with your Mayor here in Chicago, Mayor Kennelly, Mayor Hynes of Boston, Mayor Morrison of New Orleans, Mayor Hartsfield of Atlanta, Mayor Robinson of Frisco, Mayor Tucker of St. Louis and down the line, excluding the speaker, you have a very wonderful group of mayors throughout the country who are very sincerely looking after the affairs of

the minority groups in their respective cities.

Governor Craig: Mayor, you know you amaze me. Here a minute ago, you had no confidence in several of the governors throughout the United States that would pass on to local government their rights after they were retrieved from the Federal Government. Now you have built up all these mayors until you have gotten everyone thinking they are all right, and so do I. I want you to know that these governors haven't got horns either.

Mayor Lawrence: Governor, I haven't said one word deprecating any governor in Pennsylvania.

Questioner: Governor Craig, do you think it would ever be possible for cities to dominate states?

Governor Craig: I hope not. No, I do not, although in ancient history, Athens and Sparta dominated Greece. But you don't want it that way, and neither does anyone else. We all want to work together to produce the most good governmental service for the least amount of money.

Mr. Murray: Do I have a question from the gentleman on my left, please?

Questioner: My name is Adlai Stevenson, and by way of identification, I'm unemployed, or rather undercompensated. I should like to ask Mayor Lawrence of Pittsburgh if he doesn't think, in view of the title of this discussion, Do Our States Dominate Our Cities? that the answer is that cities with Democratic mayors ought to dominate states with Republican governors?

Mayor Lawrence: Governor, as one of those who was for Stevenson before Chicago, I want to

say to you that you always come up with the right formula.

Mr. Murray: Thank you, Governor Stevenson, for your question and may I take another question, please, on my left.

Questioner: I have a question for Mayor Lawrence. Mr. Mayor, do you think the city council form of city government has outlived its usefulness?

Mayor Lawrence: I do not. I think we have the right form of government. It carries out the American concept of government in dividing the various branches, and as a substitute I don't know what you have in mind. If you didn't have a city council, you would just have a mayor and then you would have a dictatorship. So I certainly think the council system—of course there are various kinds of council systems throughout the state.

Some are like the system in my city—the councilmen are elected at-large over the city. There are some cities that have part of their council elected at-large and others by wards or districts. Then there are others that elect them solely as ward representatives. But regardless of the form, it certainly is the right approach.

Questioner: Governor Craig, how can representation be more equally distributed if rural areas control the legislatures and vote against reapportionment?

Governor Craig: I think perhaps that question was best answered a moment ago. Your resort is at the polls where you elect representatives who have it as a platform commitment that they will vote for reapportionment.

Mayor Lawrence: I'd like to add to that, Mr. Moderator, if you don't mind. I think the way to do it would be—of course in most state

they give each county at least one representative—I think we should take the smallest county in each state that gets one representative, and then use that as a mean for the selection of representatives throughout the state. In other words, if a county in Illinois, for instance, has a representative for 10,000 inhabitants of that county, then the representation should be on the basis of one legislator for each 10,000.

Mr. Murray: Gentlemen, I'm extremely sorry to interrupt, but we have come to the end of our time. Thank you very much for your most interesting discussion. May I remind our listeners that tonight's entire program will be published in the Town Meeting Bulletin. Our thanks this evening to the City Club of Chicago and to Mr. John Ruettinger, President, and his associates, Mr. Edgar Bernhard and Dale O'Brien.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

CITIES—THE PRESENT DILEMMA

1. The basic framework of American government was adopted when this was a small predominantly rural nation. Now, nearly two-thirds of all Americans live in cities. To what extent do our government institutions reflect this intensive urbanization of our community?
2. Is the perennial urban problem of deterioration being adequately met? Or, is it destroying our cities?
 - a. What evidences of urban deterioration are most striking today?
 - e. g. record housing shortages
 - bigger traffic snarls
 - spreading slums
 - zooming local taxes
 - increasingly inadequate city services, etc.
 - b. Is the problem of deterioration primarily financial? Or, is poor political organization and administration at fault?
3. What sources of revenue are available to our cities? e. g. real estate, sales, payroll taxes; city income tax; gross profits tax; state and federal aid, etc. Are these adequate?
4. How have the intensifying complexities of city living (congestion, poor housing, parking problems, increasing costs, etc.) affected the growth of the suburbs?
5. How has the spectacular growth of suburbs affected the cities?
 - a. Has it lowered the cities' population appreciably? Or, are urban populations continuing to grow at a rapid pace?
 - b. Has it reduced city revenues to any great extent?

- c. Has it resulted in complicating the political, social and economic problems of both the city and its suburbs?
 - d. Is there a confusion of boundaries and districts for purposes of taxing, community services, port administration, building, and zoning, etc.?
6. Is industry moving out of the cities? If so, why? Is its dispersal for security reasons, or a response to higher costs?

HOME RULE—WHAT IS IT?

1. Is home rule for municipalities feasible? What functions and powers would be granted to the cities that they are now denied?
2. An analysis of state-local relations made by a special committee of the Conference of Governors stated that per capita costs of government are larger in cities than in rural areas and increases as population increases; constitutional and statutory restrictions limit cities in exploiting their larger tax base and local functions are fixed. Do you agree?
3. Goodhue Livingston of the N. Y. City Planning Commission said "This talk of complete home rule for New York City is nothing but political applesauce." Do you agree? If so, is this true of all cities?
4. Mr. Livingston further stated that "Many of the city's most pressing problems have become regional matters and can never be solved by the city acting alone, because it is devoid of jurisdiction and financial potential." Do you agree?
5. Can successful home rule be assured by redistributing the money, granting further taxing power and aid to municipalities? Or, is the problem more complicated than that? Is political reorganization also necessary?
6. To what extent is the unresolved conflict between urban and rural interests within the state an obstacle to home rule?
 - a. Do most state legislatures accurately represent the state's population as it exists today? Or, is the claim that many city dwellers are virtually disenfranchised correct?
 - b. Do cities get an equitable share of state revenues? If not, have the states themselves been adequately coping with urban problems? e. g. traffic, sum clearance, etc.
 - c. Are our state constitutions and governments geared to the complexity of modern life?
 - d. Is it true that cities have been primarily Democratic and rural state legislatures predominantly Republican? If so, evaluate the charge that most state legislatures are milking the cities to strengthen traditional Republican votes?
 - e. In states where state and city governments are controlled by the same party, do the same financial problems prevail?
7. To what extent are unrepresentative state legislatures and rural-urban conflicts increasing the cities' reliance on the federal government?

- a. Evaluate the contention that the U. S. Congress is more responsive to the basic needs of urban groups than their rural-dominated legislatures?
 - b. In what major areas have municipalities relied on the federal government? e. g. slum clearance, public housing, airports, highways, etc.
 - c. Recently, city representatives through the Conference of Mayors warned that they would "unanimously and strenuously oppose any legislation" that would alter the pattern of federal-city relationships in favor of state control. Do you think they are right?
8. What would be the effect on the cities, if the present administration, true to its campaign pledges, returns to the states funds and functions now under federal control?
- a. Are the states equipped and willing to undertake all or most of the tasks relinquished by the federal government?
 - b. Although federal bureaucracy is not generally popular, will the American people accept special privilege or a vacuum at the state level in its stead?
 - c. Is the contention that many states seek to acquire power in order to keep certain things from being done correct?

CITIES—THE FUTURE

1. F. J. Osborn, chairman of The Town and Country Planning Assn. of England recently stated that there is no solution to ever-increasing urban problems. Do you agree? Are big cities becoming economically, politically and socially untenable?
2. Mr. Osborn recommends limiting the growth of big cities and reduction of their central populations. Do you agree?
3. Luther Gulick, N. Y. City Administrator, has stated that we are developing "a totally new, spread out pattern of settlement" which will "call for the invention of new forms of government, perhaps as original as was the Constitution." Do you agree? If so, what new forms of government do you envision?
 - a. Would you favor the creating of technical authorities which have power to cross political boundaries to administer certain problems?
 - b. Evaluate the suggestion of Charles Merriam, Chicago political scientist, that we create city-states, with the same sovereign powers as the present 48 states out of the larger metropolitan areas.
 - c. Evaluate the suggestion of Thomas Reed, municipal consultant, that cities should be allowed to grow politically to their proper size by the simple annexation of suburbs.
4. Is it true that unless the concept of government is broadened the cities' population of the future will be the rich, who can afford to pay higher taxes and the very poor subsidized by the gov't?
5. What can be done to rehabilitate, redevelop our cities? How can we improve transportation, tax systems, planning, services, etc.?



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 19

22. ATOMIC POWER—MANKIND'S BOON OR DESTRUCTION? Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, Dr. Paul Aebersold, September 29, 1953.
23. WHAT MAKES PROSPERITY—MAN OR MACHINE? Paul Mazur, Robert S. Byfield, October 6, 1953.
24. SHOULD WE TALK WITH RUSSIA? Rep. John M. Vorys, William F. Deedes, October 13, 1953.
25. HOW CAN OUR SCHOOLS BEST PROMOTE DEMOCRACY? Dr. Hollis L. Caswell, Dr. W. Robert Smith, October 20, 1953.
26. ATOMIC DEFENSE: HOW MUCH AND WHERE? Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Dr. James R. Killiam, Jr. October 27, 1953.
27. HOW CAN WE HELP SATELLITE NATIONS TO OBTAIN FREEDOM? Lt. Francis Jarecki, Rep. Alvin E. O'Konski, Ernest K. Lindley, November 3, 1953.
28. IS THERE A PLACE FOR NEUTRALISM IN THE WORLD TODAY? W. Averell Harriman, A. S. Lall, November 10, 1953.
29. IS INDUSTRY EFFECTIVELY USING THE LIBERAL ARTS GRADUATE? Robert J. Blakely, Earl Bunting, Cecil Puckett, November 17, 1953.
30. WHAT CAN WE EXPECT IN KOREA? Col. Ben C. Limb, Robert A. Smith, November 24, 1953.
31. ARE THE STATES YIELDING TOO MUCH POWER TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT? Charles B. Brownson, Richard Bolling, Dec. 1, 1953.
32. HOW CAN WE STAY ALIVE ON THE HIGHWAY? G. D. Sontheimer, David M. Baldwin, December 8, 1953.
33. WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS FOR THE PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM? Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Interrogators: Thomas R. Underwood, Weldon James, December 15, 1953.
34. WHAT'S HAPPENING TO THE WEATHER? Robb Sagendorph, William J. Baxter, December 22, 1953.
35. FLYING SAUCERS: FACT OR ILLUSION? Donald E. Keyhoe, Jonathan N. Leonard, December 29, 1953.
36. DOES WIRE TAPPING VIOLATE THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY? Morris L. Ernst, Richardson Dilworth, January 5, 1954.
37. WHAT IS OUR STAKE IN EUROPE? Theodore H. White, William Henry Chamberlin, January 12, 1954.
38. TODAY'S TENSIONS: HOW CAN WE MEET THEM? Marynia Farnham, Ernest O. Melby, G. Bromley Oxnam, January 19, 1954.
39. HOW CAN WE MEET THE CHALLENGE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY? Anna M. Kross, Thomas C. Hennings, January 26, 1954.
40. THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS FOR THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW. James P. Mitchell. Interrogators: Meryln S. Pitzele, Henry Kaiser, February 2, 1954.
41. ARE WE TRAINED TO THINK FOR OURSELVES? Wayne Morse, Felix Morley, February 9, 1954.
42. ARE THE STATES DOMINATING THE CITIES? George M. Craig, David Lawrence, February 16, 1954.

Order single copies at 25c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.
New York 36, N. Y.

Bulletins prior to Volume 19, Number 13, are only 15c a copy.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:.....

26 Weeks for Only
\$3.00
Single Copies 25c